

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 6770
APPLICANT NAME: Bay Area Clean Water Agencies
PROJECT TITLE: San Francisco Bay Area Recycling and Desalination Implementation Proposal

FUNDS REQUESTED: \$ 39,380,000
COST MATCH: \$159,395,815
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$198,775,815

DESCRIPTION: Desalination/demineralization projects. These projects are listed as near-term priority projects for the Bay Area in the draft Bay Area IRWM Plan. The projects provide important water supply reliability, water quality, groundwater management, and environmental protection benefits to the region. These projects are integral to realizing regional supply reliability and recycled water objectives set forth in the draft Bay Area IRWM Plan.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 2

The applicant has not adopted the IRWMP. They have a schedule to adopt the IRWMP in December 2006. They need to complete 4 Functional Area documents first before they can compile and complete the IRWMP. The applicant provided a schedule that shows the 4 Functional Area documents will be completed by March 2006. This application shares the same IRWMP as PIN 7092 and has the same regional boundary as that application. PIN 6770 is also in proximity to/overlaps PINs 5996, 6456, and 6624. PINs 6770, 7092, and 6624 have agreed to consolidate proposals.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The region is defined as the San Francisco Bay Area watershed and RWB Region 2 and is the same region (and IRWMP) as PIN 7092. The applicant provided a map of the participating agencies and a map of the major water infrastructure, but the maps do not appear to cover the same region. The water infrastructure map was difficult to read. The applicant discussed each agency's water supply and demand for 2020 in good detail and provided an overview of water quality. The social and cultural makeup for the region was not discussed very well. More discussion was needed on the infrastructure for water supply, wastewater treatment, recycled water, desalination, etc. The reason why this region is appropriate for an IRWMP was not fully described in the application.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The objectives were developed as part of the CALFED Bay Area Water Quality and Water Supply Reliability Project. Five objectives are listed in the application, and challenges related to these objectives are discussed. However, the applicant did not demonstrate the process that was used to determine the objectives and as this functional area document represents only a portion of the total IRWMP. It is not certain that those five objectives are the objectives for the entire IRWMP. The applicant states that the objectives and priorities serve to steer the planning and implementation of water management policies and projects that will benefit Bay Area water agencies and California as a whole.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The applicant lists more than the required minimum IRWMP standards and gives a brief description and references to where more detail is provided elsewhere in the application. In addition, a discussion is provided for the range of water management strategies that are considered to meet the objectives of the IRWMP. The strategies to achieve objectives are listed, although no discussion could be found of how multiple water strategies work together to achieve stated objectives.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The application includes a presentation of both short- and long-term priorities. However, the long-term priority projects are not specifically identified as all the long term projects on the list are either planning or program type documents. The application does not adequately address how the IRWMP's decision making process will be responsive to regional change, nor how implementation of projects will be assessed. Project sequencing is not addressed.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The application includes a table of projects that will be implemented by the IRWMP. This table also includes a timeline and linkages for the projects. Responsibility for implementing the projects is also included in the table. However, a discussion regarding the economic or technical feasibility of projects on a programmatic level is not provided. Linkages or interdependence between projects was not clearly identified in the application. The institutional structure "will be formalized once the functional area documents are brought together."

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant describes the potential negative impacts due to water recycling projects. Table 5-2 lists most projects as not having any identified negative impacts. However, there was no indication that any evaluation to support this conclusion had been conducted. No comments about negative impacts for two functional areas: stormwater management-flood control and watershed-habitat protection are provided. There was no discussion about the advantages of regional planning for these two functional areas. Interregional benefits and impacts were not discussed. Benefits to DACs were not discussed. An evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources was not provided.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant lists the short-term projects but no data, technical methods, or analysis could be found in the application. Metrics for performance tracking with a short list of things to be tracked was shown in a table. Exactly how the metrics will monitor performance is unclear. Since the applicant does not discuss any of the data to be collected or made available for any of the projects, any data gaps are unknown. A means to measure the performance of each project is not addressed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant states that three mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to the public and stakeholders will likely include, but not limited to websites, newsletters, and project-specific workshops. Additional details of data management and tracking will be developed in future stages of project and program development. The application did not describe of how data management might occur. The applicant states that the organization, maintenance, and reporting of project data for the near-term priority projects will be consistent with established statewide data management strategies as appropriate. However, no examples of how this could be done are given. Surface water and groundwater quality data collected by the project will be provided to SWAMP and GAMA programs respectively.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The application identifies the general public, both local and regional, and the environment as beneficiaries of the IRWMP. The IRWMP identifies local agency funds and State grants and loans as sources of funding for each project listed. It appears as though the applicant is heavily relying on State and federal grants to implement these projects. Projected capital and O&M costs are listed in a table in the application. It is unclear from the information presented which funds would be used to pay for capital costs and which would be used to pay for O&M.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant did not discuss how the IRWMP relates to regional and local planning. A discussion of coordination with local land-use planners is not included. The applicant does not discuss how local planning documents relate to the IRWM and the dynamics between the two levels of planning.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP considers stakeholders to be primarily local agencies, with only brief mention made of other possible interested parties. This needs to be improved during the planning process. The applicant needed to describe processes to identify stakeholders, how stakeholders participate in planning and implementation, and how stakeholders may influence decisions to receive a high score. No discussion of public outreach specific to individual stakeholder groups is given. Partnerships are alluded to, but not specified. Environmental justice concerns are not discussed. DACs within the region and how they are involved in the planning process is not discussed. Obstacles to IRWMP implementation are not discussed.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

9

Applicant provided good descriptions of each proposed project. The projects will focus primarily on water supply reliability, with some groundwater management, and one project will address habitat restoration. However, while there were five objectives listed in the IRWMP, only two of the objectives are discussed in connection with the proposed projects. The applicant discussed water quality issues in connection with the proposed projects, did not discuss specifically how the proposal is consistent with the IRWMP or how the integration of the proposed projects along with other actions in the IRWMP provide multiple benefits. Nor did they not discuss the scientific basis for the projects. There are intermittent references to feasibility reports and relatively generic metrics are provided without supporting discussion.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

6

While the application includes a table of projects that are high priority and included for funding in the proposal, it does not rank the projects in order of priority. The application states that a deliberate effort is made not rank projects in the proposal. A clear relation of the priority projects to the IRWMP is not evident, as several of the projects listed in the proposal could not be found in the IRWMP. The application contains a table that lists potential projects that may meet statewide priorities.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The cost tables for the overall proposal and individual project costs in Attachment 7 appear reasonable and also list sources of funding match. An additional table is listed for a project titled "BACWA Grant Management/Coordination/Reporting", is also listed even though it doesn't show as a separate project in the proposal. Tables in Attachment 7 show land costs, planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The application includes schedules for the sequencing and timing of each project contained within the proposal. However, some of the projects' schedules should have contained more information. Some budgets contain information that was truncated. Better formatting should have been used.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The need for each individual project is addressed and justified. However, whether the 10 projects are the best way to address the regional needs is not assessed. A discussion is provided of current water management systems and individual agency water needs in year 2020 under differing supply conditions, but citations for the source of this information are not provided. The application demonstrates how the proposal will assist in meeting the water supply, water quality, and environmental restoration needs of the planning region. The application states that the negative consequences of not implementing the proposal are widespread and severe water shortages in future drought years, and hampered environmental restoration efforts.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The proposal recognizes that there are disadvantaged areas within Bay Area communities and shows that there would only be indirect benefits to those areas, along with all other areas, affected by the projects. For example, a recycling project within the EBMUD service area would free up water to be used throughout the whole service area, even though the direct benefits of the project, e.g. irrigated parks, would not be in the disadvantaged areas. It is questionable how much direct benefit to DACs is contained in this proposal. Most benefit to DACs is in the form of quality of life benefits (e.g. ecosystem restoration and improved San Francisco Bay water quality). The proposal depicts a table that indicates percentage of DAC in comparison to total regional population.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Taken as a whole the 10 projects together do meet the Program Preferences. For example, 3 of the 10 projects directly address meeting water quality standards, and one addresses impaired waters and sensitive habitats. However, the applicant did not discuss the integration of the projects.

TOTAL SCORE: 75